

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 02-1873**

---

CHARLES ERSKINE,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

BOARD OF EDUCATION OF PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY,  
MARYLAND; PAUL LEWIS, SR.; SUSAN DEPLATCHETT;  
STERLING I. MARSHALL,

Defendants - Appellees.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of  
Maryland, at Greenbelt. Deborah K. Chasanow, District Judge. (CA-  
00-2552-DKC)

---

Submitted: February 25, 2003

Decided: March 10, 2003

---

Before NIEMEYER, WILLIAMS, and MOTZ, Circuit Judges.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Mary Ann Ryan, Laurel, Maryland, for Appellant. Sheldon L. Gnatt,  
KNIGHT, MANZI, NUSSBAUM, & LAPLACA, Upper Marlboro, Maryland, for  
Appellees.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.  
See Local Rule 36(c).

PER CURIAM:

Charles Erskine appeals the district court's order granting summary judgment in favor of the Appellees and dismissing his complaint in which he alleged violations of the First Amendment, the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment, and Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended, 42 U.S.C.A. §§ 2000e to 2000e-17 (West 1994 & Supp. 2002). We affirm.

This Court reviews an award of summary judgment de novo. Higgins v. E. I. Dupont de Nemours & Co., 863 F.2d 1162, 1167 (4th Cir. 1988). Summary judgment is appropriate when there is no genuine issue of material fact, given the parties' burdens of proof at trial. Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(c); Anderson v. Liberty Lobby, Inc., 477 U.S. 242, 247-49 (1986). In determining whether the moving party has shown that there is no genuine issue of material fact, a court must assess the factual evidence and all inferences to be drawn therefrom in the light most favorable to the non-moving party. Id. at 255; Smith v. Virginia Commonwealth Univ., 84 F.3d 672, 675 (4th Cir. 1996).

With these standards in mind, we affirm on the reasoning of the district court. Erskine v. Board of Ed., No. CA-00-2552-DKC (D. Md. July 2, 2002; Apr. 16, 2002). We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in

the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED